

Remarks

Claim Objections:

Claims 1-6, 7-11 and 13-14 were objected to because of multiple informalities. In response, these claims have been amended as suggested by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC 112

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. In response, claim 6 has been amended to recite the step of “hashing the advertisement and combining a hash result with a public key to derive the content encryption key”. This limitation is found on page 4, lines 16-18 of the Specification, where it is stated that “[i]n another embodiment, the hash result is combined with the DRM public key 117 to produce the CEK”.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC 102 and 35 USC 103:

On October 30th, 2007 a telephone conversation was had with Examiner Nguyen. In that conversation the differences between the amended claims and the prior art were discussed. The Examiner and the Applicants reached agreement in that the limitation of “deriving a content encryption key from the rendered advertisement” is novel when compared to the *cited* art. More particularly, the prior art cited by Examiner Nguyen obtains a content encryption key after rendering an advertisement, however, the key is not derived from the rendered advertisement. Examiner Nguyen will conduct another search and if necessary, suggest amendments to the claims to get over any new art cited.

Respectfully Submitted,
Vogler, ET AL.

By: /Kenneth Haas/
Reg. No. 42,614
Phone: (847) 576-6937
FAX: (847) 576-3750

